

DIALLEL CROSS ANALYSIS FOR EARLINESS, YIELD, ITS COMPONENTS AND RESISTANCE TO LATE WILT IN MAIZE

EL-HOSARY A. A. A¹ & I. A. I. EL-FIKI²

¹Department of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Egypt

²Department of Plant Pathology, Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Egypt

ABSTRACT

A half diallel set of crosses involved eight yellow maize inbred lines were evaluated in normal and artificial infection by late wilt environments at the Agricultural Research and Experiment Center, Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Egypt. To estimate combining ability, improve productivity of maize and resistant to late wilt in Egypt. Mean squares of environments, genotypes and its fractions as well as general and specific combining abilities (GCA and SCA) reached the significance level of probability for all traits. High GCA/SCA ratios exceeded than unity were obtained for days to 50% silking and resistance to late wilt% in artificial infection environment and across environments. For remain cases, non-additive type of gene action seemed to be more prevalent. Ten crosses in both and across experiments, gave significant superiority over SC 168. The useful superiority over SC 168 ranged from 10.02 to 33.59 %. Two crosses P1xP2 and P2xP3 in both and across experiments had significant superiority over the best check hybrid Hytech 2055 by 14.68 and 15.49% in the combined analysis. The parental inbred line P2 exhibited the most accurate general combiner for earliness and grain yield plant-1. The cross P2xP3 was contain most desirable inter and intra-allelic interactions for most traits.

KEYWORDS: Combining Ability, Diallel Analysis, Yellow Maize, Resistant to Late Wilt

Received: Nov 05, 2015; **Accepted:** Nov 14, 2015; **Published:** Nov 19, 2015; **Paper Id.:** IJASRDEC201527

INTRODUCTION

Great efforts are devoted to increase maize productivity with a high resistance to disease and pests. Several diseases attack maize fields. One of the most destructive diseases in maize growing areas in lower and Upper Egypt is late wilt. It is caused by fungi called *Cephalosporium maydis*. The degree of lose may be up to 80% in fields. Late wilt disease is wide spread and serious. Therefore, breeding new resistance hybrids is practical, inexpensive and effective for controlling this disease.

Several methods are available to study the inheritance yield productivity and disease resistance. One of the common use in this respect is the diallel cross methodology for its power and versatility. Different approaches to the diallel analysis for estimating certain genetic parameters in terms of gene models have been developed. Total genetic variation is portioned into the effects of general (GCA) and specific (SCA) combining ability. In this context, GCA is the average performance of an inbred line in hybrid combinations and as such it is primarily recognized as a measure of additive gene action. SCA indicates non-additive gene action and it desirable those instances in which certain hybrid combinations perform relatively desirable than would be expected on the mean performance of inbred lines involved

(Sprague and Tatum 1942).

The objective of the present investigation is to evaluate eight maize inbred lines and their F1 hybrid according to general and specific combining ability for earliness, grain yield, its components and resistance to late wilt disease.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Eight yellow maize inbred lines i.e. M-201(P1), M-202(P2), M-203(P3), M-204 (P4), M-241(P5), M-224(P6), M-228(P7) and M-524(P8) were sown in two different sowing dates (2nd and 12th May 2013) in order to make half diallel crosses by hand pollination giving a total of 28 hybrids.

In the 2013 season, two experiments were carried out. The first was a normal trial and the second involved artificial infection with late wilt disease. The inoculum was prepared by growing the fungus (*Cephalosporium maydis*) isolates in sterilized milk bottles containing wet cracked grain sorghum kept at room temperature for 45 days. The infection in the field was made according to **Shafshaket al. (1986)**. Each experiment contained 28 crosses and their parents along with single crosses SC 168 and Hytech 2055 (check hybrids) were grown in a randomized complete block design with three replications at the Agricultural Research and Experiment Center, Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Egypt. The sowing of the two experiments was on 6th June 2014. Each plot consisted of two ridges, 70-cm between ridges. The long of ridge was 6-m. Three kernels per hill were sown in one side of the ridge with 25-cm spacing between hills. Normal cultural practices were followed for maize growing in the area.

The traits studied were: days to 50% silking, plant height, resistance to late wilt disease% (percent of resistant plants in each plot following 105 days from sowing) according to **Sabetet al.(1961)**, number of kernels row-1, number of rows ear-1, 100-kernel weight and grain yield plant-1 adjusted to 15.5% grain moisture. Fifteen guarded plants from each plot were randomly taken as samples tested for the previous traits except days to 50% silking where; the mean basis of plot was used.

Statistical analysis was done according to **Steel and Torri (1980)**. Relative superiority of grain yield was estimated for each cross as the percentage deviation of F1 mean performance from check variety SC Hytech 2055 average value. Genetic analysis was done as described by **Griffing (1956)** for method 2 model 1. The combined analysis across the two experiments was carried out according to (**Gomez and Gomez, 1984**) whenever, homogeneity of error variance was found.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results obtained from parental inbred lines and their F1's for all traits studied in each and across, the two experiments were first subjected to an ordinary analysis of variance as presented in Table 1. The mean squares due to environments were significant for all studied traits except for days to 50% silking and No. of rows ear-1. These results are indicated that the plants generally remained symptomless until flowering stage. Also, the number of rows ear-1 was formed in the ear before the flowering agrees with the findings of **Mostafaet al. (1996)**, **Viveket al.(2010)** and **El-Gonemy(2015)**. Genotype mean squares were highly significant for all traits studied. Its fractions *i.e.* parents, crosses and parentvs crosses reached significant levels in most cases.

Appreciable genotypes by environment interaction were detected for all traits except for No. of rows ear-1 and 100-kernel weight indicating that the genotypes behaved rather differently from normal environment to late wilt infection

environment. For the exceptional traits, insignificant genotype by environment was detected revealing that the genotypes were suspected to environmental changes by nearly similar magnitudes. Insignificant interactions between parental inbred lines and environments were detected in all traits except plant height. This may reveal the high repeatability of the parental inbred lines under different environments. Significant interaction between F1 hybrids and environment were detected for days to 50% silking, No of kernels row-1, late wilt resistance% and grain yield plant-1, indicating that these crosses behave differently from environment to another. Insignificant interactions occurred between parent vs hybrids and environment for all studied traits except for grain yield plant-1 revealing that average of heterosis over all crosses was influence by environmental changes.

Mean Performance and Superiority

The mean performances of tested the eight inbred lines and the 28 hybrids across environments for all traits as well as grain yield plant-1 and resistance to late wilt % in normal and infection environment and across them and superiority over both checks (SC 168 and Hytech 2055) are presented in Tables (2 a and b). For days to 50% silking date, the inbred line No. 2 gave the earliest parents. However, inbred line P7 gave the lateness one. Days to 50% silking for crosses, ranged from 57.42 for cross P4xP8 to 63.92 for cross P3xP6 while all crosses were earliest than both check hybrids. For plant height (cm), means ranged from 248.75 for cross P4xP6 to 290.54 for cross P3xP5. The results indicate that most crosses were shorter than the two check hybrids, for No of rows ear-1, means ranged from 8.9 for P2 to 14.55 for P6, while, ranged from 11.93 for cross P5xP6 to 15.47 for cross P1xP6. Most crosses gave higher No. of rows ear-1 compared with the two check hybrids. The parental inbred lines P7 gave the lowest number of kernels row-1. However, the parent inbred line P1 gave the highest one for this trait. The two crosses P1xP2 and P1xP3 gave the highest number of kernels row-1 and significant differences from two check hybrids. However cross P4xP5 gave the lowest ones, but without significant difference from check hybrids. The inbred lines P1 and P5 recorded heavier 100-kernel weight. On the other hand, the parental inbred line P7 gave the lowest one for this trait. For the 100-kernel weight (g) means of crosses ranged from 31.0 for P1xP6 to 45.67 for cross P2xP3. For resistance to late wilt disease, means ranged from 76.67 for cross P6xP8 to 100.00 for P1, P5, P2xP4, P2xP6, P3xP8, P5xP6, P5xP7 and P5xP8 at normal condition, Means ranged from 58.33 for P3 to 100% for P1, P5, P1xP5, P2xP4, P2xP6, P5xP7 at infection trial. However, means ranged from 68.33 for P3 to 100% for P1, P5, P1xP5, P2xP4, P2xP6 and P5xP7 in the combined analysis.

For grain yield plant-1, the two crosses P1xP2 and P2xP3 in both experiments as well as the combined analysis had significant superiority over the best check hybrid Hytech 2055 by 14.68 and 15.49% in the combined analysis.

The ten crosses of P1xP2, P1xP3, P1xP5, P2xP3, P2xP5, P3xP8, P4xP6, P4xP7, P4xP8 and P5xP7, in both and across experiments and the combined analysis, gave significant superiority over SC 168 by 33.59, 23.63, 17.62, 34.54, 14.25, 16.23, 11.66, 16.32 and 10.02%, respectively. In addition, the crosses P1xP5 and P5xP7 gave the highest grain yield with resistance to late wilt. Hence, it could be concluded that these crosses offer possibility for improving grain yield in maize. These crosses may be released as commercial hybrids after further testing and evaluation. The previous crosses exhibited significant increase of two or more of traits contributing to grain yield plant-1. The fluctuation of hybrids from normal and infection environments was detected for most traits.

The mean squares associated with general and specific combining abilities were highly significant in all studied traits (Table 1). To get an idea about the produced performance of single-cross progeny in each case, the relative size of

general to specific combining ability mean squares may be helpful. High ratios which largely exceeded the unity were obtained for days to 50% silking in both and across environments and resistance to late wilt% in artificial infection environment as well as the combined analysis. This indicates that the largest part of the total genetic variability was

associated with those traits giving additive and additive by additive gene action. For remain cases, non-additive type of gene action seemed to be more prevalent. The genetic variance reported by **El-Roubyet al. (1973)**, **El-Hosry, (1989)** and **El-Hosary et al. (2006)** to be mostly due to additive type of gene action for earliness. The non-additive genetic variance was reported by **Singh and Roy (2007)**, **Osman et al. (2012)**, **Zare et al. (2011)**, **Gouda et al. (2013)**, **Abdel-Moneam et al. (2014)**, **El-Ghonemy (2015)** and **Kamara (2015)** to be most prevalent for grain yield and most of its components. However other researcher **Derera et al. (2008)**, **Viveket al. (2010)**, **Sibiya et al. (2011)**, **Ibrahim (2012)**, **El-Hosary and Elgammaal (2013)** and **El-Hosary (2014)** found that the additive play the major role in inheritance of grain yield. **Akbar et al. (2008)** and **Hefny (2010)** reported that both additive and non-additive effects were equal in expression of genetic variability for the yield and its components traits in maize.

Significant GCA and SCA by environments mean squares were obtained for all studied traits except No. of rows ear-1 and 100-kernel weight, indicating that the magnitude of GCA and SCA varied from one environment to another. These findings agree to a large extent with those obtained from the ordinary analysis of variance.

Tables (3a and 3b) illustrate the estimates of \hat{g}_i effects for individual parental inbred lines at the combined across environment. High positive values would be of interest under all studied traits except days to 50% silking and plant height where negative one would be useful from the breeder point of view for earliness and lodging resistance. General combining ability effects computed herein were significantly different from zero in all traits. Significant negative \hat{g}_i effects were detected by parental inbred lines P1, P4 and P8 for days to 50 % silking and P1, P4, P7 and P8 for plant height. Meanwhile, the significant positive \hat{g}_i effects were detected by parental inbred lines P1, P3, P6 and P8 for No of rows ear-1; P1, P2 and P6 for No of kernel row-1; P2, P3, P5 and P8 for 100- kernel weight; P1 and P5 for resistant to late wilt and P1, P2, P3 and P6 for grain yield plant-1.

The aforementioned inbred line which had high \hat{g}_i effects for grain yield plant-1, also, possessed one or more of the traits contributing to grain yield. It is of interest for plant breeders to ask whether the GCA for parental inbred lines agrees with its own performance or where some parents are more potent when crossed than would be expected from their own performance. The results show positive correlation coefficient between the parental performance and the corresponding \hat{g}_i effects obtained for all studied traits. Therefore, it could be concluded that the high performing hybrids could be reached except that crossing is carried out between parental inbred lines characterized by high mean performances. For grain yield plant-1, plant height and 100-kernel weight the insignificant correlation coefficients between \hat{g}_i effects and mean performance was detected. This disagreement suggests that hybrids characterized by these traits could be expected by crossing between inbred lines with a low performance for these characters. Also, it could be concluded that the GCA variance had been with dominance with effects to a certain degree (**Jinks 1955**). The parental inbred line P2 exhibited the most accurate general combiner for earliness and grain yield plant-1.

The parental inbred lines combinations specific combining ability \hat{S}_{ij} effects for all studied traits across environments are presented in Tables (4 a-b). twenty two, zero, twenty, twenty, fifteen, nine and twenty two crosses give desirable \hat{S}_{ij} effects for days to 50% silking, plant height, no of rows ear-1, No of kernels row, 100- kernel weight, resistant to late wilt% and grain yield plant-1, respectively. The most desirable inter and intra-allelic interactions were represented;

by P4xP7, P4xP8, P5xP6, P5xP8, P6xP7 and P7xP8 for days to 50% silking, P3xP8 and P5xP7 for No of rows ear-1, P1xP3 for No of kernels row-1, P2xP3 for 100-kernel weight, P2xP3, P2xP4, P2xP6 and P3xP6 for resistant to late wilt% and P1xP2 and P2xP3 for grain yield plant-1. Such combinations may be of interest in breeding programs aimed at excellent hybrids since they surpassed the best performing for these traits or produce new inbred lines as most combinations involved at least one good combiner parent or produced synthetic varieties.

CONCLUSIONS

The previous results could be showed that the parental inbred line P1 was the good general combiner for earliness, resistant to late wilt and grain yield plant-1. The crosses P1xP2 and P2xP3 had high productivity and these crosses were superior over the check hybrids. However, the cross P2xP3 was contain most desirable inter and intra-allelic interactions for most traits.

REFERENCES

1. **Abdel-Moneam, M.A., Sultan, M.S., Salama, S.M.G. & El Oraby, A.M. (2014).** Evaluation of combining ability and heterosis for yield and its components traits of five maize inbreds under normal and stress nitrogen fertilization. *Asian J. Crop Sci.*, 6: 142-149.
2. **Akbar, M., Saleem, M., Muhammad, F., Ashraf, M.K. & Ahmed, R.A. (2008).** Combining ability analysis in maize under normal and high temperature conditions. *J. Agric. Res.*, 64: 27-38.
3. **Derera, J., Tongoona, P., Pixly, K.V., Vivek, B., Laing, M.D. & Van Rij N.C. (2008).** Gene action controlling gray leaf spot resistance in southern African maize germplasm. *Crop Sci.* 48: 93-98.
4. **El-Gonemy, M.A.M. (2015).** Combining Ability of Seven New White Maize Inbred Lines for Yield and Some Agronomic Traits. *Egyptian Journal of Plant Breeding* 19 (1): 15 – 24.
5. **El-Hosary, A.A.A. & Elgammaal, A.A. (2013).** Combining ability, heterosis and assessing genetic diversity using rapid marker in maize. *Minufiya J. Agric. Res.* 38 (1): 109-125
6. **El-Hosary, A.A.A. (2014).** Relative values of three different testers in evaluating combining ability of new maize inbred lines. *International J. of Plant Breeding and genetics* 5(2): 57-65.
7. **El-Hosary, A.A. (1989).** Heterosis and combining ability of six inbred lines of maize in diallel crosses over two years. *Egypt. J. Agron.* 14(1-2): 47-58
8. **El-Hosary, A.A., El-Badawy, M.E.L.M. & Abdel-Tawab, Y.M. (2006).** Genetic distance of inbred lines and prediction of maize single-cross performance using RAPD and SSR markers. *Egypt. J. Genet. Cytol.* 35: 209-224.
9. **El-Rouby, M. M., Koraiem, Y.S. and Nawar, A.A. (1973).** Estimation of genetic variance and its components in maize under stress and non-stress environment. *Egypt. J. Genet. Cyto.*, 2: 10-19.

10. **Gomez, K.N. & Gomez, A.A. (1984).** *Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research.* John.Wiley and Sons. Inc., New York, 2nd ed.
11. **Gouda, R.K., Kage, U., Lohithaswa, H.C., Shekara, B.G. and Shobha, D. (2013).** *Combining ability studies in maize (Zea mays L.)* Mol. Plant Breed., 3: 116-127.
12. **Griffing, B. (1956).** *Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel crossing systems.* Aus. J. of Biol. Sci. 9: 463-493.
13. **Hefny, M. (2010).** *Genetic Control of Flowering Traits, Yield and its Components in Maize (Zea mays L.) at Different Sowing Dates.* Asian J. Crop Sci., 2: 236-249.
14. **Ibrahim, Kh.A.M. (2012).** *Combining analysis of some yellow (Zea mays L.) inbreds for grain yield and other traits.* Egypt J.Agric. Res. 90 (4): 33-46.
15. **Kamara M. Mohamed (2015).** *Diallel analysis of some yellow maize inbred lines under low and normal nitrogen levels.* International J. of Plant Breeding and genetics 9(2): 32-43.
16. **Mostafa, M.A., Abd El-Aziz, A.A., Mahgoub, G.M.A. & El-Sherbieny, H.Y.S. (1996).** *Diallel analysis of grain yield and natural resistance to late wilt disease in newly developed inbred lines of maize.* Bull. Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ. 47: 393- 404.
17. **Osman, M.M.A., Ibrahim Kh.A.M. & El-Ghonemy, M.A.M. (2012).** *Diallel analysis of grain yield and some other traits in yellow maize (Zea mays L.) inbred lines.* Assuit J. Agric. Sci. 43: 16-26.
18. **Sabel, K.A., Samra, A.S. & Hingurani, I.K. (1961).** *Stalk and root rot of maize in U.A.R.* F.A.O. plant protect. Bull. 9: 121-125.
19. **Shafshak, S.E., Shokr, El-Sayed A., El-Hosary, A.A. & Sedhom, S.A. (1986).** *Breeding studies on maize I-late wilt disease resistance.* Ann. Agric., Sci. Moshtohor 24(3): 1321-1333.
20. **Sibiya, J., Tongoona, P., Derera, J. & Van Rij, N. (2011).** *Genetic analysis and genotype x environment (GxE) for grey leaf spot disease resistance in elite African maize (Zea mays L.) germplasm.* Euphytica, 179(1):312-325.
21. **Singh, P.K. & Roy, A.K. (2007).** *Diallel analysis of inbred lines in maize (Zea mays L.).* Intl. J. Agric. Sci. 3(1):213-216.
22. **Sprague, G.F. & Tatum, L.A. (1942).** *General V.S. specific combining ability in single crosses of corn.* J. Am. Soc. Agron. 34: 923-932.
23. **Steel, R.G. & Torrie, J.H. (1980).** *Principles and Procedures of Statistics.* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Toronto, London.
24. **Vivek, B.S., Odongo, O., Njuguna, J., Imanywoha, J., Bigirwa, G., Diallo, A. & Pixley, K. (2010).** *Diallel analysis of grain yield and resistance to seven diseases of 12 African maize (Zea mays L.) inbred lines.* Euphytica 172: 329-340.
25. **Zare, M., Choukan, R., Heravan, E.M., Bihamta, M.R. and Ordookani, K. (2011).** *Gene action of some agronomic traits in corn (Zea mays L.) Using diallel cross analysis.* Afr. J. Agric. Res., 6: 693-703

APPENDICES

Table 1: Mean of Squares from Ordinary Analysis for Studied Traits in Normal Environment, Artificial Infection by Late wilt Disease and Across the Previous Environments.

SOV	DF	Mean squares						
		Days to 50% silking	Plant height	No of Rows ear-1	No of kernels row-1	100-kernel kernel weight	Resistant to late wilt%	Grain yield plant-1
Normal environment								
Replication	2	4.97*	150.42*	0.79	0.56	1.00	25.93	38.03**
Genotype (G)	35	56.17**	4772.73**	9.33**	110.09**	54.42**	157.06**	7718.44
Parent (P)	7	43.41**	3757.87**	9.41**	108.43**	13.69**	178.57**	3798.95**
Crosses (F1)	27	10.80**	505.19**	2.88**	31.93**	28.82**	157.18**	2636.92**
P vs.F1	1	1370.48**	127100.42**	183.06**	2231.86**	1030.92**	3.24	172355.99**
Error	70	1.13	46.81	0.47	2.65	3.87	33.54	79.08
GCA	7	19.47**	215.26**	1.68**	21.73**	9.57**	41.09**	650.93**
SCA	28	18.54**	1934.82**	3.47**	40.44**	20.28**	55.17**	3053.28**
Error	70	0.38	15.60	0.16	0.88	1.29	11.18	26.36
GCA/SCA	-	1.05	0.11	0.48	0.54	0.47	0.74	0.21
Artificial Infection Environment by Late Wilt Disease								
Replication	2	5.58**	94.02	1.74*	3.56	17.07*	31.84	82.12
Genotype (G)	35	55.16**	5469.70**	10.43**	97.43**	58.75**	344.29**	8779.67**
Parent (P)	7	28.06**	955.85**	11.13**	78.14**	23.23**	536.36**	2833.69**
Crosses (F1)	27	18.71**	446.66**	2.59**	31.64**	30.34**	304.35**	2564.60**
P vs.F1	1	1229.13**	172688.63**	217.00**	2008.83**	1074.47**	78.26	218208.26**
Error	70	0.72	94.49	0.38	1.55	3.53	31.27	75.67
GCA	7	21.39**	325.84**	1.89**	16.45**	10.09**	191.59**	425.35**
SCA	28	17.64**	2197.58**	3.87**	36.48**	21.96**	95.56**	3551.86**
Error	70	0.24	31.50	0.13	0.52	1.18	10.42	25.22
GCA/SCA	-	1.21	0.15	0.49	0.45	0.46	2.00	0.12
Combined Across Environment								
Environment (E)	1	0.49	11022.45**	0.07	10.67**	13.73**	2660.02**	289.14**
Rep/E	4	5.28**	122.22	1.27*	2.06	9.04*	28.88	60.08
Genotype (G)	35	108.92**	9991.20**	19.53**	199.86**	110.95**	435.71**	16330.73**
Parent (P)	7	69.79**	3861.48**	20.44**	184.13**	33.57**	656.27**	6574.85**
Crosses (F1)	27	26.89**	911.69**	5.23**	54.38**	57.15**	392.57**	5049.55**
P vs.F1	1	2597.69**	298045.79**	399.33**	4237.75**	2105.17**	56.68	389213.82**
G x E	35	2.42**	251.23**	0.23	7.66**	2.23	65.64**	167.37**
P x E	7	1.68	852.24**	0.10	2.44	3.35	58.65	57.78
F1 x E	27	2.63**	40.15**	0.24	9.19**	2.02	68.96**	151.97**
P vs. F1 x E	1	1.92	1743.26**	0.72	2.93	0.23	24.83	1350.43**
Error	140	0.93	70.65	0.43	2.10	3.70	32.41	77.38
GCA	7	39.42**	450.75**	3.52**	35.81**	19.06**	197.48**	1036.69**
SCA	28	35.53**	4050.31**	7.26**	74.32**	41.46**	132.18**	6545.30**
GCA x E	7	1.43**	90.35**	0.05	2.37**	0.60	35.20**	39.59
SCA x E	28	0.65**	82.09**	0.08	2.60**	0.78	18.55*	59.84**
Error	140	0.31	23.55	0.14	0.70	1.23	10.80	25.79
GCA/SCA	--	1.11	0.11	0.48	0.48	0.46	1.49	0.16

* and ** indicate $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$, respectively.

Table 2: Mean Performance of all Genotypes for Earliness, Plant Height, no of Rows Ear-1, no of Kernels row-1 and 100-Kernel Weight at the Combined Analysis Across the Studied Environments and Resistance of Genotypes to Late wilt in Both and Across Environments

genotype	Days to 50% Silking	plant Height	No of Rows ear ⁻¹	No of Kernels row ⁻¹	100-Kernel weight	resistance to late wilt %		
						N.	Inf.	Comb.
P ₁	72.00	156.25	11.45	35.85	34.50	100.00	100.00	100.00
P ₂	63.71	210.33	8.90	27.13	30.17	93.33	88.33	90.83
P ₃	65.83	203.17	9.48	18.63	30.50	78.33	58.33	68.33
P ₄	66.58	207.21	11.03	30.28	29.83	96.67	90.00	93.33
P ₅	72.42	144.33	10.37	26.05	34.33	100.00	100.00	100.00
P ₆	70.83	186.46	14.55	35.00	29.83	96.67	91.67	94.17
P ₇	72.63	165.63	11.53	25.28	28.33	96.67	91.67	94.17
P ₈	68.38	165.04	9.00	28.13	28.67	85.00	80.67	82.83

Table 2: Contd.,								
P ₁ xP ₂	59.50	278.46	15.00	46.77	39.00	80.00	75.00	77.50
P ₁ xP ₃	62.08	265.21	14.42	47.04	39.00	93.33	91.67	92.50
P ₁ xP ₄	60.38	259.63	14.77	38.33	38.17	98.33	83.33	90.83
P ₁ xP ₅	62.42	289.75	15.25	39.92	39.33	100.00	100.00	100.00
P ₁ xP ₆	62.63	272.29	15.47	34.73	31.00	98.33	90.00	94.17
P ₁ xP ₇	63.58	269.67	12.73	36.23	33.50	96.67	91.67	94.17
P ₁ xP ₈	63.00	266.29	13.23	38.83	37.67	96.67	91.67	94.17
P ₂ xP ₃	58.21	276.75	14.80	41.62	45.67	98.33	90.00	94.17
P ₂ xP ₄	56.63	250.46	13.93	38.73	36.67	100.00	100.00	100.00
P ₂ xP ₅	61.50	290.08	14.62	41.17	38.67	83.33	73.33	78.33
P ₂ xP ₆	59.00	258.88	15.30	39.07	35.67	100.00	100.00	100.00
P ₂ xP ₇	57.71	254.79	14.82	35.53	37.17	93.33	86.67	90.00
P ₂ xP ₈	57.04	267.75	13.57	37.67	42.00	93.33	83.33	88.33
P ₃ xP ₄	60.88	265.54	13.12	37.93	41.33	90.00	75.00	82.50
P ₃ xP ₅	62.29	290.54	12.75	38.97	39.00	86.67	83.33	85.00
P ₃ xP ₆	63.92	262.25	15.03	37.47	38.17	91.67	91.67	91.67
P ₃ xP ₇	62.71	261.17	13.63	37.67	39.00	93.33	75.00	84.17
P ₃ xP ₈	63.42	284.96	14.53	35.50	42.21	100.00	75.00	87.50
P ₄ xP ₅	62.63	275.25	14.17	33.83	31.67	98.33	91.67	95.00
P ₄ xP ₆	60.83	248.75	14.17	38.60	40.00	88.33	75.00	81.67
P ₄ xP ₇	58.38	252.21	14.12	40.87	37.67	83.33	66.67	75.00
P ₄ xP ₈	57.42	256.00	13.67	40.33	40.83	83.33	83.33	83.33
P ₅ xP ₆	61.38	283.00	11.93	41.73	40.00	100.00	93.33	96.67
P ₅ xP ₇	61.83	279.75	15.33	39.37	37.67	100.00	100.00	100.00
P ₅ xP ₈	59.67	281.00	13.20	37.83	37.47	100.00	96.67	98.33
P ₆ xP ₇	60.96	269.42	13.07	38.87	34.67	81.67	66.67	74.17
P ₆ xP ₈	60.21	268.08	13.10	39.81	38.67	76.67	78.33	77.50
P ₇ xP ₈	59.58	258.33	13.97	36.18	40.00	96.67	86.67	91.67
SC 168	65.00	290.00	12.00	32.40	34.00	97.00	86.00	91.50
SC Hytech 2055	69.00	302.00	12.13	43.20	48.33	98.00	93.00	95.50
mean of parent	69.05	179.80	10.79	28.30	30.77	93.33	87.58	90.46
mean of cross	60.71	269.15	14.06	38.95	38.28	93.23	85.86	89.54
mean of Genotype	62.79	251.75	13.27	36.65	36.85	93.25	86.18	89.71
L.S.D 5%	1.54	13.45	1.05	2.32	3.08	9.41	9.08	9.11
L.S.D 1%	2.02	17.64	1.37	3.04	4.04	12.48	12.04	11.95

N., Inf. and Comb. refer to normal, artificial infection by late wilt disease and combined analysis across the two environments, respectively.

Table 3: Mean Performance of all Genotypes for Grain Yield plant⁻¹ and the Yield Superiority Over SC 168 and SC Hytech 2055 at Normal Environment (n), Infection by Late wilt (inf.) and across the Previous Environments

genotype	grain yield plant ⁻¹								
	N	Inf.	C.						
P ₁	140	132.33	136.17	Relative superiority					
P ₂	77.33	71.33	74.33						
P ₃	53	50.67	51.83						
P ₄	98.67	89	93.83						
P ₅	91.67	89	90.33						
P ₆	164.33	143.33	153.83						
P ₇	81.67	78.33	80	Over Single cross 168			Over Single cross Hytech 2055		
P ₈	102.33	98.67	100.5	N	inf.	Comb.	N	Inf.	Comb.
P ₁ xP ₂	260	255.67	257.83	33.33**	33.86**	33.59**	16.42**	12.96**	14.68**
P ₁ xP ₃	236.9	240.33	238.62	21.49**	25.83**	23.63**	6.07	6.19	6.13
P ₁ xP ₄	203	209.67	206.33	4.10	9.77*	6.91	-9.10**	-7.36*	-8.23**
P ₁ xP ₅	221.67	232.33	227	13.68**	21.64**	17.62**	-0.75	2.65	0.96

Table 3: Contd.,

P ₁ xP ₆	163	158.67	160.83	-16.41**	-16.93**	-16.67**	-27.01**	-29.90**	-28.47**
P ₁ xP ₇	137.33	149	143.17	-29.57**	-21.99**	-25.82**	-38.51**	-34.17**	-36.32**
P ₁ xP ₈	166.33	178.67	172.5	-14.70**	-6.46	-10.62**	-25.52**	-21.06**	-23.28**
P ₂ xP ₃	253.33	266	259.67	29.91**	39.27**	34.54**	13.43**	17.53**	15.49**
P ₂ xP ₄	199.33	190.67	195	2.22	-0.17	1.04	-10.75**	-15.76**	-13.27**
P ₂ xP ₅	220	221	220.5	12.82**	15.71**	14.25**	-1.49	-2.36	-1.93
P ₂ xP ₆	206.67	208	207.33	5.98	8.90*	7.43*	-7.46*	-8.10*	-7.78*
P ₂ xP ₇	180.6	188	184.3	-7.38	-1.57	-4.51	-19.13**	-16.94**	-18.03**
P ₂ xP ₈	214	195	204.5	9.74*	2.09	5.96	-4.18	-13.84**	-9.04**
P ₃ xP ₄	194	193.33	193.67	-0.51	1.22	0.35	-13.13**	-14.58**	-13.86**
P ₃ xP ₅	187	185.67	186.33	-4.1	-2.79	-3.45	-16.27**	-17.97**	-17.12**
P ₃ xP ₆	209	208	208.5	7.18	8.90*	8.03*	-6.42	-8.10*	-7.26*
P ₃ xP ₇	185.67	198	191.83	-4.79	3.66	-0.6	-16.87**	-12.52**	-14.68**
P ₃ xP ₈	215	233.67	224.33	10.26**	22.34**	16.23**	-3.73	3.24	-0.22
P ₄ xP ₅	152.67	143.67	148.17	-21.71**	-24.78**	-23.23**	-31.64**	-36.52**	-34.10**
P ₄ xP ₆	199.33	218.33	208.83	2.22	14.31**	8.20*	-10.75**	-3.53	-7.12*
P ₄ xP ₇	218.33	212.67	215.5	11.97**	11.34**	11.66**	-2.24	-6.04	-4.15
P ₄ xP ₈	222	227	224.5	13.85**	18.85**	16.32**	-0.6	0.29	-0.15
P ₅ xP ₆	181.2	194.33	187.77	-7.08	1.75	-2.71	-18.87**	-14.14**	-16.49**
P ₅ xP ₇	210	214.67	212.33	7.69*	12.39**	10.02**	-5.97	-5.15	-5.56
P ₅ xP ₈	191.67	190.67	191.17	-1.71	-0.17	-0.95	-14.18**	-15.76**	-14.97**
P ₆ xP ₇	157	167.67	162.33	-19.49**	-12.22**	-15.89**	-29.70**	-25.92**	-27.80**
P ₆ xP ₈	162	185	173.5	-16.92**	-3.14	-10.10**	-27.46**	-18.26**	-22.83**
P ₇ xP ₈	175	196	185.5	-10.26**	2.62	-3.89	-21.64**	-13.40**	-17.49**
SC 168	195	191	193						
SC Hytech 2055	223.33	226.33	224.83						
mean of parent	101.13	94.08	97.6						
mean of cross	197.22	202.2	199.71						
mean of Genotype	177.61	179.78	178.7						
L.S.D 5%	14.44	14.13	14.08						
L.S.D 1%	19.15	18.74	18.46						

*and ** indicate $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$, respectively. N., Inf. and Comb. refer to normal, artificial infection by late wilt disease and combined analysis across the two environments, respectively.

Table 4: GCA Effects (\hat{g}_i) of the Studied Parental Inbred Lines for Earliness, Plant Height, no of Rows ear-1 and no of kernels Row-1 and 100-kernel Weight across the Two Environments

Parents	Days to 50% silking	Plant height	No of rows ear ⁻¹	No of kernels row ⁻¹	100-kernel weight
P ₁	1.46**	-2.99**	0.38**	2.43**	-0.28*
P ₂	-2.60**	5.42**	-0.02	0.56**	0.57**
P ₃	0.21**	6.91**	-0.28**	-1.58**	1.59**
P ₄	-1.27**	-2.14**	0.00	0.00	-0.35**
P ₅	1.35**	3.44**	-0.20**	-0.43**	0.30*
P ₆	0.76**	-0.81	0.72**	1.10**	-1.17**
P ₇	0.70**	-6.71**	0.07	-1.40**	-1.32**
P ₈	-0.59**	-3.12**	-0.67**	-0.68**	0.67**
L.S.D(0.05) gi	0.13	1.12	0.09	0.19	0.26
L.S.D(0.01) gi	0.17	1.47	0.11	0.25	0.34
L.S.D(0.05) gi-gj	0.24	2.13	0.17	0.37	0.49
L.S.D(0.01) gi-gj	0.32	2.79	0.22	0.48	0.64
r	0.88**	0.42	0.86**	0.88**	0.15

* and ** indicate $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$, respectively. r indicate the correlation coefficient between (\hat{g}_i) effects for parents and its mean performance. N., Inf. and Comb. refer to normal, artificial infection by late wilt disease and combined analysis across the two environments, respectively.

Table 5: GCA Effects \hat{g}_i of the Studied Parental Inbred Lines for Resistant to Late Wilt% and Grain Yield Plant⁻¹ at Both and Across the Studied Environments

Parents	Resistant to Late Wilt %			Grain Yield Plant ⁻¹		
	N	Inf.	Comb.	N	Inf.	Comb.
P ₁	2.62**	4.94**	3.78**	8.55**	8.54**	8.54**
P ₂	-0.21	1.11	0.45	10.58**	6.34**	8.46**
P ₃	-2.71**	-7.56**	-5.13**	0.41	2.28	1.34*
P ₄	-0.21	-1.89	-1.05**	0.32	-3.03*	-1.35*
P ₅	3.12**	6.44**	4.78**	-3.52*	-4.32**	-3.92**
P ₆	-0.71	0.44	-0.13	2.41	2.31	2.36**
P ₇	0.12	-1.73	-0.80*	-15.55**	-12.09**	-13.82**
P ₈	-2.04*	-1.76	-1.90**	-3.21*	-0.02	-1.62**
L.S.D(0.05) gi	1.97	1.90	0.76	3.02	2.96	1.17
L.S.D(0.01) gi	2.61	2.52	1.00	4.01	3.92	1.54
L.S.D(0.05) gi-gj	2.98	2.87	1.44	4.57	4.47	2.23
L.S.D(0.01) gi-gj	3.95	3.81	1.89	6.06	5.93	2.92
r	0.85**	0.89**	0.88**	0.27	0.30	0.29

* and ** indicate $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$, respectively.

Respectively. N., Inf. and Comb. Refer to Normal, Infection by Late Wilt Disease and Combined Analysis Across the Two Environments, Respectively.

Table 6: SCA Effects \hat{S}_{ij} of the Studied Diallel Crosses for Earliness, Plant Height, No of Rows Ear⁻¹ and No of Kernels Row⁻¹ and 100-Kernel Weight across the Two Environments

Crosses	Days to 50% Silking	Plant Height	No of Rows Ear ⁻¹	No of Kernels Row ⁻¹	100-Kernel Weight
P ₁ xP ₂	-1.91**	26.73**	1.31**	7.20**	2.11**
P ₁ xP ₃	-2.14**	11.99**	0.98**	9.61**	1.08
P ₁ xP ₄	-2.37**	15.46**	1.06**	-0.68	2.19**
P ₁ xP ₅	-2.95**	40.00**	1.74**	1.34*	2.71**
P ₁ xP ₆	-2.14**	26.79**	1.04**	-5.38**	-4.16**
P ₁ xP ₇	-1.13**	30.07**	-1.05**	-1.38**	-1.51*
P ₁ xP ₈	-0.42	23.10**	0.20	0.50	0.67
P ₂ xP ₃	-1.96**	15.13**	1.76**	6.06**	6.90**
P ₂ xP ₄	-2.06**	-2.11	0.162*	1.60**	-0.16
P ₂ xP ₅	0.19	31.93**	1.50**	4.46**	1.19
P ₂ xP ₆	-1.71**	4.97	1.27**	0.82	-0.34
P ₂ xP ₇	-2.94**	6.79*	1.43**	-0.21	1.31
P ₂ xP ₈	-2.32**	16.15**	0.92**	1.21*	4.15**
P ₃ xP ₄	-0.62	11.48**	0.06	2.93**	3.48**
P ₃ xP ₅	-1.83**	30.90**	-0.11	4.40**	0.50
P ₃ xP ₆	0.39	6.85*	1.26**	1.36*	1.13
P ₃ xP ₇	-0.76*	11.67**	0.50*	4.06**	2.12**
P ₃ xP ₈	1.24**	31.87**	2.15**	1.18*	3.34**
P ₄ xP ₅	-0.01	24.66**	1.04**	-2.31**	-4.89**
P ₄ xP ₆	-1.21**	2.40	0.12	0.92	4.91**
P ₄ xP ₇	-3.61**	11.76**	0.71**	5.68**	2.72**
P ₄ xP ₈	-3.27**	11.96**	1.01**	4.44**	3.90**
P ₅ xP ₆	-3.29**	31.07**	-1.92**	4.48**	4.26**
P ₅ xP ₇	-2.77**	33.72**	2.13**	4.61**	2.08**
P ₅ xP ₈	-3.65**	31.38**	0.74**	2.37**	-0.11
P ₆ xP ₇	-3.05**	27.64**	-1.06**	2.58**	0.54
P ₆ xP ₈	-2.51**	22.71**	-0.28	2.80**	2.55**

Table 6: Contd.,					
P ₇ xP ₈	-3.08**	18.86**	1.23**	1.68**	4.04**
LSD5% (sij)	0.70	6.10	0.47	1.05	1.40
LSD1% (sij)	0.92	8.00	0.62	1.38	1.83
LSD5% (sij-sik)	1.03	9.02	0.70	1.56	2.07
LSD1% (sij-sik)	1.35	11.83	0.92	2.04	2.71
LSD5% (sij-skl)	0.34	3.01	0.23	0.52	0.69
LSD1% (sij-skl)	0.45	3.94	0.31	0.68	0.90

* and ** indicate $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$, respectively.

**Table 7: SCA Effects (\hat{S}_{ij}) of the Studied Diallel Crosses for Resistance to Late Wilt
Disease and Grain Yield Plant⁻¹ in Both and Across the Studied Environments.**

Crosses	Resistance to Late Wilt%			Grain Yield Plant ⁻¹		
	N	inf.	N	inf.	N	inf.
P ₁ xP ₂	-15.43**	-17.04**	-16.23**	65.01**	62.61**	63.81**
P ₁ xP ₃	0.41	8.29**	4.35*	52.07**	51.34**	51.71**
P ₁ xP ₄	2.91	-5.71	-1.40	18.27**	25.97**	22.12**
P ₁ xP ₅	1.24	2.63	1.93	40.78**	49.94**	45.36**
P ₁ xP ₆	3.41	-1.37	1.02	-23.82**	-30.36**	-27.09**
P ₁ xP ₇	0.91	2.46	1.68	-31.53**	-25.63**	-28.58**
P ₁ xP ₈	3.07	2.49	2.78	-14.87**	-8.03	-11.45**
P ₂ xP ₃	8.24**	10.46**	9.35**	66.47**	79.21**	72.84**
P ₂ xP ₄	7.41*	14.79**	11.10**	12.56**	9.17*	10.87**
P ₂ xP ₅	-12.59**	-20.21**	-16.40**	37.08**	40.81**	38.94**
P ₂ xP ₆	7.91*	12.46**	10.18**	17.81**	21.17**	19.49**
P ₂ xP ₇	0.41	1.29	0.85	9.70*	15.57**	12.64**
P ₂ xP ₈	2.57	-2.01	0.28	30.76**	10.51*	20.64**
P ₃ xP ₄	-0.09	-1.54	-0.82	17.40**	15.91**	16.65**
P ₃ xP ₅	-6.76*	-1.54	-4.15*	14.25**	9.54*	11.89**
P ₃ xP ₆	2.07	12.79**	7.43**	30.31**	25.24**	27.78**
P ₃ xP ₇	2.91	-1.71	0.60	24.94**	29.64**	27.29**
P ₃ xP ₈	11.74**	-1.67	5.03*	41.93**	53.24**	47.59**
P ₄ xP ₅	2.41	1.13	1.77	-20.00**	-27.16**	-23.58**
P ₄ xP ₆	-3.76	-9.54**	-6.65**	20.74**	40.87**	30.81**
P ₄ xP ₇	-9.59**	-15.71**	-12.65**	57.70**	49.61**	53.65**
P ₄ xP ₈	-7.43*	0.99	-3.22	49.02**	51.87**	50.45**
P ₅ xP ₆	4.57	0.46	2.52	6.45	18.17**	12.31**
P ₅ xP ₇	3.74	9.29**	6.52**	53.21**	52.91**	53.06**
P ₅ xP ₈	5.91	5.99*	5.95**	22.54**	16.84**	19.69**
P ₆ xP ₇	-10.76**	-18.04**	-14.40**	-5.72	-0.73	-3.22
P ₆ xP ₈	-13.59**	-6.34*	-9.97**	-13.06**	4.54	-4.26
P ₇ xP ₈	5.57	4.16	4.87*	17.90**	29.94**	23.92**
LSD5% (sij)	6.03	5.83	4.13	9.26	9.06	6.38
LSD1% (sij)	8.00	7.73	5.42	12.29	12.02	8.37
LSD5% (sij-sik)	8.93	8.62	6.11	13.71	13.41	9.44
LSD1% (sij-sik)	11.84	11.44	8.01	18.18	17.79	12.38
LSD5% (sij-skl)	8.42	8.13	2.04	12.92	12.64	3.15
LSD1% (sij-skl)	11.17	10.78	2.67	17.14	16.77	4.13

* and ** indicate $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$, respectively.

N., Inf. and comb. refer to normal, infection by late wilt disease and combined analysis across the two environments, respectively.

